

PBW THEOREMS AND FROBENIUS STRUCTURES FOR QUANTUM MATRICES

FABIO GAVARINI

Università di Roma “Tor Vergata” — Dipartimento di Matematica
Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, I-00133 Roma — ITALY

ABSTRACT. Let $G \in \{Mat_n(\mathbb{C}), GL_n(\mathbb{C}), SL_n(\mathbb{C})\}$, let $\mathcal{O}_q(G)$ be the quantum function algebra — over $\mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$ — associated to G , and let $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$ be the specialisation of the latter at a root of unity ε , whose order ℓ is odd. There is a quantum Frobenius morphism that embeds $\mathcal{O}(G)$, the function algebra of G , in $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$ as a central Hopf subalgebra, so that $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$ is a module over $\mathcal{O}(G)$. When $G = SL_n(\mathbb{C})$, it is known by [BG], [BGStaf] that (the complexification of) such a module is free, with rank $\ell^{dim(G)}$. In this note we prove a PBW-like theorem for $\mathcal{O}_q(G)$, and we show that — when G is Mat_n or GL_n — it yields explicit bases of $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$ over $\mathcal{O}(G)$. As a direct application, we prove that $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(GL_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(M_n)$ are free Frobenius extensions over $\mathcal{O}(GL_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}(M_n)$, thus extending some results of [BGStro].

§ 1 The general setup

Let G be a complex semisimple, connected, simply connected affine algebraic group. One can introduce a quantum function algebra $\mathcal{O}_q(G)$, a Hopf algebra over the ground ring $\mathbb{C}[q, q^{-1}]$, where q is an indeterminate, as in [DL]. If ε is any root of 1, one can specialize $\mathcal{O}_q(G)$ at $q = \varepsilon$, which means taking the Hopf $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G) := \mathcal{O}_q(G) / (q - \varepsilon)\mathcal{O}_q(G)$. In particular, for $\varepsilon = 1$ one has $\mathcal{O}_1(G) \cong \mathcal{O}(G)$, the classical (commutative) function algebra over G . Moreover, if the order ℓ of ε is odd, then there exists a Hopf algebra monomorphism $\mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{r}: \mathcal{O}(G) \cong \mathcal{O}_1(G) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$, called *quantum Frobenius morphism for G* , which embeds $\mathcal{O}(G)$ inside $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$ as a central Hopf subalgebra. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$ is naturally a module over $\mathcal{O}(G)$. It is proved in [BGStaf] and in [BG] that such a module is free, with rank $\ell^{dim(G)}$. In the special case of $G = SL_2$, a stronger result was given in [DRZ], where an explicit basis was found. We shall give similar results when G is GL_n or $M_n := Mat_n$; namely we provide explicit bases of $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$ as a free module over $\mathcal{O}(G)$, where in addition everything is defined replacing $\mathbb{C}$ with $\mathbb{Z}$. The proof is via some (more or less known) PBW theorems for $\mathcal{O}_q(M_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_q(GL_n)$ — and $\mathcal{O}_q(SL_n)$ as well — as modules over $\mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$.

Let $M_n := Mat_n(\mathbb{C})$. The algebra $\mathcal{O}(M_n)$ of regular functions on M_n is the unital associative commutative $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra with generators $\bar{t}_{i,j}$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, n$). The semigroup structure on M_n yields on $\mathcal{O}(M_n)$ the natural bialgebra structure given by matrix product — see [CP],

Keywords: *PBW theorems, quantum groups, roots of unity.*

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 20G42; Secondary 81R50.

Ch. 7. We can also consider the semigroup-scheme $(M_n)_{\mathbb{Z}}$ associated to M_n , for which a like analysis applies: in particular, its function algebra $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(M_n)$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -bialgebra, with the same presentation as $\mathcal{O}(M_n)$ but over the ring $\mathbb{Z}$.

Now we define quantum function algebras. Let R be any commutative ring with unity, and let $q \in R$ be invertible. We define $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$ as the unital associative R -algebra with generators $t_{i,j}$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, n$) and relations

$$\begin{aligned} t_{i,j} t_{i,k} &= q t_{i,k} t_{i,j}, & t_{i,k} t_{h,k} &= q t_{h,k} t_{i,k} & \forall & j < k, i < h, \\ t_{i,l} t_{j,k} &= t_{j,k} t_{i,l}, & t_{i,k} t_{j,l} - t_{j,l} t_{i,k} &= (q - q^{-1}) t_{i,l} t_{j,k} & \forall & i < j, k < l. \end{aligned}$$

It is known that $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$ is a bialgebra, but we do not need this extra structure in the present work (see [CP] for further details — cf. also [AKP] and [PW]).

As to specialisations, set $\mathbb{Z}_q := \mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$, let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be odd, let $\phi_\ell(q)$ be the ℓ -th cyclotomic polynomial in q , and let $\varepsilon := \bar{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon := \mathbb{Z}_q / (\phi_\ell(q))$, so that ε is a (formal) primitive ℓ -th root of 1 in $\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon$. Then

$$\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n) = \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(M_n) / (\phi_\ell(q)) \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(M_n) \cong \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(M_n).$$

It is also known that there is a bialgebra isomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(M_n) \cong \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(M_n) / (q-1) \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(M_n) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(M_n), \quad t_{i,j} \bmod (q-1) \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(M_n) \mapsto \bar{t}_{i,j}$$

and a bialgebra monomorphism, called *quantum Frobenius morphism* (ε and ℓ as above),

$$\mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{r}_{\mathbb{Z}} : \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(M_n) \cong \mathcal{O}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(M_n) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n), \quad \bar{t}_{i,j} \mapsto t_{i,j}^\ell|_{q=\varepsilon}$$

whose image is *central* in $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n)$. Thus $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n) := \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(M_n)$ becomes identified — via $\mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{r}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, which clearly extends to $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n)$ by scalar extension — with a central subbialgebra of $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n)$, so the latter can be seen as an $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n)$ -module. By the result in [BGStaf] and [BG] mentioned above, we can expect this module to be free, with rank ℓ^{n^2} .

All the previous framework also extends to GL_n and to SL_n instead of M_n . Indeed, consider the *quantum determinant* $D_q := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n} (-q)^{\ell(\sigma)} t_{1,\sigma(1)} t_{2,\sigma(2)} \cdots t_{n,\sigma(n)} \in \mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$, where $\ell(\sigma)$ denotes the *length* of any permutation σ in the symmetric group $\mathcal{S}_n$. Then D_q belongs to the centre of $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$, hence one can extend $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$ by a formal inverse to D_q , i.e. defining the algebra $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n) := \mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)[D_q^{-1}]$. Similarly, we can define also $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n) := \mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n) / (D_q - 1)$. Now $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$ are Hopf R -algebras, and the maps $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$, $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$, $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$ (the third one being the composition of the first two) given by $t_{i,j} \mapsto t_{i,j}$ are epimorphisms of R -bialgebras, and even of Hopf R -algebras in the second case. The specialisations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(GL_n) &= \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(GL_n) / (\phi_\ell(q)) \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(GL_n) \cong \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(GL_n) \\ \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(SL_n) &= \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(SL_n) / (\phi_\ell(q)) \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(SL_n) \cong \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(SL_n) \end{aligned}$$

enjoy the same properties as above, namely there exist isomorphisms $\mathcal{O}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(GL_n) \cong \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(GL_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(SL_n) \cong \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(SL_n)$ and there are quantum Frobenius morphisms

$$\mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{r}_{\mathbb{Z}} : \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(GL_n) \cong \mathcal{O}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(GL_n) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(GL_n), \quad \mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{r}_{\mathbb{Z}} : \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(SL_n) \cong \mathcal{O}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(SL_n) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(SL_n)$$

described by the same formulæ as for M_n . Moreover, $D_q^{\pm 1} \bmod (q-1) \mapsto D^{\pm 1}$ in the isomorphisms and $D^{\pm 1} \cong D_q^{\pm 1} \bmod (q-1) \mapsto D_q^{\pm \ell} \bmod (q-\varepsilon)$ in the quantum Frobenius morphisms for GL_n (which extend those of M_n). In addition, all these isomorphisms and quantum Frobenius morphisms are compatible (in the obvious sense) with the natural maps which link $\mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(M_n)$, $\mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(GL_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_q^{\mathbb{Z}_q}(SL_n)$, and their specialisations, to each other.

Like for M_n , the image of the quantum Frobenius morphisms are *central* in $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(GL_n)$ and in $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(SL_n)$. Thus $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(GL_n) := \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(GL_n)$ identifies to a central Hopf subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(GL_n)$, and $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(SL_n) := \mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(SL_n)$ identifies to a central Hopf subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(SL_n)$; so $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(GL_n)$ is an $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(GL_n)$ -module and $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(SL_n)$ is an $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(SL_n)$ -module.

In §2, we shall prove (Theorem 2.1) a PBW-like theorem providing several different bases for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$, $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$ as R -modules. As an application, we find (Theorem 2.2) explicit bases of $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n)$ as an $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n)$ -module, which then in particular is free of rank $\ell^{\dim(M_n)}$. The same bases are also $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(GL_n)$ -bases for $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(GL_n)$, which then is free of rank $\ell^{\dim(GL_n)}$. Both results can be seen as extensions of some results in [BGStaf].

Finally, in §3 we use the above mentioned bases to prove that $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n)$ is a *free Frobenius extension* of its central subalgebra $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(M_n)$, and to explicitly compute the associated Nakayama automorphism. The same we do for $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(GL_n)$ as well. Everything follows from the ideas and methods in [BGStro], now applied to the explicit bases given by Theorem 2.2.

§ 2 PBW-like theorems

Theorem 2.1. (PBW theorem for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$, $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$ as R -modules)

Assume $(q-1)$ is not invertible in $R_q := \langle q, q^{-1} \rangle$, the subring of R generated by q and q^{-1} .

(a) Let any total order be fixed in $\{1, \dots, n\}^{\times 2}$. Then the following sets of ordered monomials are R -bases of $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$, resp. $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$, resp. $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$, as modules over R :

$$\begin{aligned} B_M &:= \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} \mid N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \forall i, j \right\} \\ B_{GL}^\wedge &:= \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} D_q^{-N} \mid N, N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \forall i, j; \min(\{N_{i,i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} \cup \{N\}) = 0 \right\} \\ B_{GL}^\vee &:= \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} D_q^Z \mid Z \in \mathbb{Z}, N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \forall i, j; \min\{N_{i,i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} = 0 \right\} \\ B_{SL} &:= \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} \mid N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \forall i, j; \min\{N_{i,i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} = 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

(b) Let $\preceq$ be any total order fixed in $\{1, \dots, n\}^{\times 2}$ such that $(i, j) \preceq (h, k) \preceq (l, m)$ whenever $j > n+1-i$, $k = n+1-h$, $m < n+1-l$. Then the following sets of ordered monomials are R -bases of $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$, resp. $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$, as modules over R :

$$\begin{aligned} B_{GL}^{\wedge, -} &:= \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} D_q^{-N} \mid N, N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \forall i, j; \min(\{N_{i, n+1-i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} \cup \{N\}) = 0 \right\} \\ B_{GL}^{\vee, -} &:= \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} D_q^Z \mid Z \in \mathbb{Z}, N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \forall i, j; \min\{N_{i, n+1-i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} = 0 \right\} \\ B_{SL}^- &:= \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} \mid N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \forall i, j; \min\{N_{i, n+1-i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} = 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Roughly speaking, our method is a (partial) application of the diamond lemma (see [Be]): however, we do not follow it in all details, as we use a specialisation trick as a shortcut.

If we prove our results for the algebras defined over R_q instead of R , then the same results will hold as well by scalar extension. Thus we can assume $R = R_q$, and then we note that, by our assumption, *the specialised ring $\overline{R} := R/(q-1)R \neq \{0\}$ is non-trivial.*

Proof of (a): (see also [Ko], Theorem 3.1, and [PW], Theorem 3.5.1)

We begin with $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$. It is clearly spanned over R by the set of all (possibly unordered) monomials in the t_{ij} 's: so we must only prove that any such monomial belongs to the R -span of the *ordered* monomials. In fact, the latter are linearly independent, since such are their images via specialisation $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)/(q-1)\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n) \cong \mathcal{O}_1^{\overline{R}}(M_n)$.

Thus, take any (possibly unordered) monomial in the t_{ij} 's, say $\underline{t} := t_{i_1, j_1} t_{i_2, j_2} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k}$, where k is the degree of $\underline{t}$: we associate to it its *weight*, defined as

$$w(\underline{t}) := (k, d_{1,1}, d_{1,2}, \dots, d_{1,n}, d_{2,1}, d_{2,2}, \dots, d_{2,n}, d_{3,1}, \dots, d_{n-1,n}, d_{n,1}, d_{n,2}, \dots, d_{n,n})$$

where $d_{i,j} := |\{s \in \{1, \dots, k\} \mid (i_s, j_s) = (i, j)\}| = \text{number of occurrences of } t_{i,j} \text{ in } \underline{t}$. Then $w(\underline{t}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n^2+1}$, and we consider $\mathbb{N}^{n^2+1}$ as a totally ordered set with respect to the (total) lexicographic order $\leq_{lex}$. By a quick look at the defining relations of $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} t_{i,j} t_{i,k} &= q t_{i,k} t_{i,j}, & t_{i,k} t_{h,k} &= q t_{h,k} t_{i,k} & \forall \quad j < k, i < h, \\ t_{i,l} t_{j,k} &= t_{j,k} t_{i,l}, & t_{i,k} t_{j,l} - t_{j,l} t_{i,k} &= (q - q^{-1}) t_{i,l} t_{j,k} & \forall \quad i < j, k < l. \end{aligned}$$

one easily sees that the weight defines an *algebra filtration* on $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$.

Now, using these same relations, one can re-order the t_{ij} 's in any monomial according to the fixed total order. During this process, only two non-trivial things may occur, namely:

- 1) some powers of q show up as coefficients (when a relation in first line is employed);
- 2) a new summand is added (when the bottom-right relation is used);

If only steps of type 1) occur, then the process eventually stops with an *ordered* monomial in the t_{ij} 's multiplied by a power of q . Whenever instead a step of type 2) occurs, the newly added term is just a coefficient $(q - q^{-1})$ times a (possibly unordered) monomial in the t_{ij} 's, call it $\underline{t}'$: however, by construction $w(\underline{t}') \not\leq_{lex} w(\underline{t})$. Then, by induction on the weight, we can assume that $\underline{t}'$ lies in the R -span of the ordered monomials, so we can ignore the new summand. The process stops in finitely many steps, and we are done with $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$.

Second, we look at $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$. Let us consider $f \in \mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$. By definition, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f D_q^N \in \mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$; therefore, by the result for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$ just proved, we can expand $f D_q^N$ as an R -linear combination of ordered monomials, call them $\underline{t} = \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}}$. Thus, f itself is an R -linear combination of monomials $\underline{t} D_q^{-N}$, so the latter span $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$.

Now consider an ordered monomial $\underline{t} = \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}}$ in which $N_{i,i} > 0$ for all i . Then we can re-arrange the $t_{i,i}$'s in $\underline{t}$ so to single out a factor $t_{1,1} t_{2,2} \cdots t_{n-1,n-1} t_{n,n}$, up to “paying the cost” (perhaps) of producing some new summands of *lower weight*: the outcome reads

$$\underline{t} = q^s \underline{t}_0 t_{1,1} t_{2,2} \cdots t_{n-1,n-1} t_{n,n} + \text{l.t.'s} \tag{2.1}$$

for some $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, with $\underline{t}_0 := \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j}}$ having lower weight than $\underline{t}$, and the expression *l.t.'s* standing for an R -linear combination of some monomials $\underline{\tilde{t}}$ such that $w(\underline{\tilde{t}}) \not\leq_{lex} w(\underline{t})$.

Then we re-write the monomial $t_{1,1} t_{2,2} \cdots t_{n-1,n-1} t_{n,n}$ using the identity

$$t_{1,1} t_{2,2} \cdots t_{n-1,n-1} t_{n,n} = D_q - \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n \\ \sigma \neq id}} (-q)^{\ell(\sigma)} t_{1,\sigma(1)} t_{2,\sigma(2)} \cdots t_{n,\sigma(n)} = D_q + l.t.'s \quad (2.2)$$

and we replace the right-hand side of (2.2) inside (2.1). We get $\underline{t} = q^s \underline{t}_0 D_q + l.t.'s$ (for D_q is central!), where now $\underline{t}_0$ and all monomials within $l.t.'s$ have strictly lower weight than $\underline{t}$.

If we look now at $\underline{t} D_q^z$ (for some $z \in \mathbb{Z}$), we can re-write $\underline{t}$ as above, thus getting

$$\underline{t} D_q^z = q^s \underline{t}_0 D_q D_q^z + l.t.'s = q^s \underline{t}_0 D_q^{z+1} + l.t.'s \quad (2.3)$$

where $l.t.'s$ is an R -linear combination of monomials $\tilde{t} D_q^{z+1}$ such that $w(\tilde{t}) \not\leq_{lex} w(\underline{t})$.

By repeated use of (2.3) as reduction argument, we can easily show — by induction on the weight — that any monomial of type $\underline{t} D_q^{-N}$ ($N \in \mathbb{N}$) can be expanded as an R -linear combination elements of $B_{GL}^\wedge$ or elements of $B_{GL}^\vee$. Thus, both these sets do span $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$.

To finish with, both $B_{GL}^\wedge$ and $B_{GL}^\vee$ are R -linearly independent, as their image through the specialisation epimorphism $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_1^{\overline{R}}(GL_n) \cong \mathcal{O}^{\overline{R}}(GL_n)$ are $\overline{R}$ -bases of $\mathcal{O}^{\overline{R}}(GL_n)$.

As to $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$, we can repeat the argument for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$. First, B_{SL} is linearly independent, for its image through specialisation $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_1^{\overline{R}}(SL_n) \cong \mathcal{O}^{\overline{R}}(SL_n)$ is an $\overline{R}$ -basis of $\mathcal{O}^{\overline{R}}(SL_n)$. Second, the epimorphism $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$ ($t_{i,j} \mapsto t_{i,j}$), and the result for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$, imply that the R -span of $S_{SL} := \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} \mid N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \forall i, j \right\}$ is

$\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$. Thus one is only left to prove that each monomial $\underline{t} = \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} \in S_{SL}$ belongs to the R -span of B_{SL} : as before, this can be done by induction on the weight, using the reduction formula $\underline{t} = q^s \underline{t}_0 D_q + l.t.'s$ (see above), and plugging in it the relation $D_q = 1$.

Alternatively, we remind there is an isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n) \otimes_R R[x, x^{-1}] \cong \mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$ (of R -algebras) given by $t_{i,j} \otimes x^z \mapsto D_q^{-\delta_{i,1}} t_{i,j} \cdot D_q^z$ (cf. [LS]). This along with the result about $B_{GL}^\vee$ clearly implies that also B_{SL} is an R -basis for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$, as claimed.

Proof of (b): First look at $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$. If $f \in \mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$, like in the proof of (a) we expand $f D_q^N$ as an R -linear combination of ordered (according to $\leq$) monomials of type $\underline{t} = \underline{t}^- \underline{t}^\pm \underline{t}^+$, with $\underline{t}^- := \prod_{j>n+1-i} t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}}$, $\underline{t}^\pm := \prod_{j=n+1-i} t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}}$ and $\underline{t}^+ := \prod_{j< n+1-i} t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}}$. So f is an R -linear combination of monomials $\underline{t}^- \underline{t}^\pm \underline{t}^+ D_q^{-N}$, hence the latter span $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$.

We show that each (ordered) monomial $\underline{t}^- \underline{t}^\pm \underline{t}^+ D_q^{-N}$ belongs both to the R -span of $B_{GL}^{\wedge,-}$ and of $B_{GL}^{\vee,-}$, by induction on the (total) degree of the monomial $\underline{t}^\pm$. The basis of induction is $\deg(\underline{t}^\pm) = 0$, so that $\underline{t}^\pm = 1$ and $\underline{t}^- \underline{t}^\pm \underline{t}^+ D_q^{-N} = \underline{t}^- \underline{t}^+ D_q^{-N} \in B_{GL}^{\wedge,-} \cap B_{GL}^{\vee,-}$.

As a matter of notation, let $\mathcal{N}^-$, resp. $\mathcal{H}$, resp. $\mathcal{N}^+$, be the R -subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_q^R(M_n)$ generated by the $t_{i,j}$'s with $j > n+1-i$, resp. $j = n+1-i$, resp. $j < n+1-i$. Note that $\mathcal{H}$ is Abelian, and $\underline{t}^- \in \mathcal{N}^-$, $\underline{t}^\pm \in \mathcal{H}$, $\underline{t}^+ \in \mathcal{N}^+$.

Now assume that all the exponents $N_{i,n+1-i}$'s in the factor $\underline{t}^\pm$ are strictly positive. As $\mathcal{H}$ is Abelian, we can draw out of $\underline{t}^\pm$ (even out of $\underline{t} = \underline{t}^- \underline{t}^\pm \underline{t}^+$) a factor $t_{n,1} t_{n-1,2} \cdots t_{2,n-1} t_{1,n}$. Now recall that D_q can be expanded as $D_q = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} (-q)^{\ell(\sigma)} t_{n,\sigma(n)} t_{n-1,\sigma(n-1)} \cdots t_{2,\sigma(2)} t_{1,\sigma(1)}$ (see, e.g., [PW] or [Ko]). Then we can re-write the monomial $t_{n,1} t_{n-1,2} \cdots t_{2,n-1} t_{1,n}$ as

$$t_{n,1} t_{n-1,2} \cdots t_{1,n} = (-q)^{-\ell(\sigma_0)} D_q - \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n \\ \sigma \neq \sigma_0}} (-q)^{\ell(\sigma) - \ell(\sigma_0)} t_{n,\sigma(n)} t_{n-1,\sigma(n-1)} \cdots t_{1,\sigma(1)} \quad (2.4)$$

where $\sigma_0 \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is the permutation $i \mapsto (n+1-i)$. Note also that we can reorder the factors in the summands of (2.4) so that all factors $t_{i,j}$ from $\mathcal{N}^-$ are on the left of those from $\mathcal{N}^+$.

Now we replace the right-hand side of (2.4) in the factor $\underline{t}^-$ within $\underline{t} = \underline{t}^- \underline{t}^+ \underline{t}^+$, thus

$$\underline{t}^- \underline{t}^+ \underline{t}^+ = (-q)^{-\ell(\sigma_0)} \underline{t}^- \underline{t}_0^- D_q \underline{t}^+ + \text{l.t.'s} = (-q)^{-\ell(\sigma_0)} \underline{t}^- \underline{t}_0^- \underline{t}^+ D_q + \text{l.t.'s}$$

Here $\underline{t}_0^- := \underline{t}^- (t_{n,1} t_{n-1,2} \cdots t_{2,n-1} t_{1,n})^{-1}$ has lower (total) degree than $\underline{t}^-$, and the expression *l.t.'s* stands for an R -linear combination of some other monomials $\hat{\underline{t}}^- \hat{\underline{t}}^+ \hat{\underline{t}}^+$ (like $\underline{t}^- \underline{t}^+ \underline{t}^+$ above) in which again the degree of $\hat{\underline{t}}^-$ is lower than the degree of $\underline{t}^-$. In fact, this holds because when any factor $t_{i,\sigma(i)} \in \mathcal{N}^-$ is pulled from the right to the left of any monomial in $\underline{t}^- \in \mathcal{H}$ the degree of $\underline{t}^-$ is not increased. By induction on this degree, we can easily conclude that every ordered monomial $\underline{t}^- \underline{t}^+ D_q^z$ (with $z \in \mathbb{Z}$) belongs to both the R -span of $B_{GL}^{\wedge,-}$ and the R -span of $B_{GL}^{\vee,-}$. That is, both sets span $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$.

Eventually, both $B_{GL}^{\wedge,-}$ and $B_{GL}^{\vee,-}$ are linearly independent, as their image through the specialisation epimorphism $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_1^R(GL_n) \cong \mathcal{O}^R(GL_n)$ are $\overline{R}$ -bases of $\mathcal{O}^R(GL_n)$.

Second, we look at $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$. Like for claim (a), we can repeat again — *mutatis mutandis* — the argument for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$, which does work again — one only has to plug in the additional relation $D_q = 1$ too. Otherwise, as an alternative proof, we can note that the isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n) \otimes_R R[x, x^{-1}] \cong \mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$ together with the result about $B_{GL}^{\vee,-}$ easily implies that B_{SL}^- too is an R -basis for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$, q.e.d. $\square$

Remarks 2.2: (1) Claim (a) of Theorem 2.1 for M_n only was independently proved in [PW] and in [Ko], but taking a field as ground ring. In [Ko], claim (b) for GL_n only was proved as well. Similarly, the analogue of claim (b) for SL_n only was proved in [Ga], §7, but taking as ground ring the field $k(q)$ — for any field k of zero characteristic. Our proof then provide an alternative, unifying approach, which yields stronger results over R .

(2) We would better point out a special aspect of the basic assumption of Theorem 2.1 about q and R . Namely, if the subring $\langle 1 \rangle$ of R generated by 1 has prime characteristic (hence it is a finite field) then the condition on $(q-1)$ is equivalent to q being transcendental over R_q or $q=1$. But if instead the characteristic of $\langle 1 \rangle$ is zero or positive non-prime, then $(q-1)$ might be non-invertible in R_q even though q is algebraic (or even integral) over $\langle 1 \rangle$.

The end of the story is that Theorem 2.1 holds true in the “standard” case of transcendental values of q , but also in more general situations.

(3) The argument used in the proof of Theorem 2.1 to get the result for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$ from those for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$, via the isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n) \otimes_R R[x, x^{-1}] \cong \mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$, actually work *both* ways. Therefore, one can also prove the results directly for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$ — as we sketched above — and from them deduce those for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$. Even more, as we have proved independently the results for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$ — i.e., $B_{GL}^{\vee}$ and $B_{GL}^{\vee,-}$ are R -bases — and for $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$ — i.e., B_{SL} and B_{SL}^- are R -bases — we can use them to prove that the algebra morphism $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n) \otimes_R R[x, x^{-1}] \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$ is in fact bijective.

(4) The orders considered in claim (b) of Theorem 2.1 refer to a *triangular decomposition* of $\mathcal{O}_q^R(GL_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_q^R(SL_n)$ which is opposite to the standard one. This opposite decomposition was introduced — and its importance was especially pointed out — in [Ko].

We are now ready to state and proof the main result of this paper:

Theorem 2.3 (PBW theorem for $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(G)$ as an $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(G)$ -module, for $G \in \{M_n, GL_n\}$).

Let any total order be fixed in $\{1, \dots, n\}^{\times 2}$. Then the set of ordered monomials

$$B_{GL}^M := \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} \mid 0 \leq N_{i,j} \leq \ell-1, \forall i, j \right\}$$

thought of as a subset of $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n) \subset \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(GL_n)$, is a basis of $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$ as a module over $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$, and a basis of $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(GL_n)$ as a module over $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(GL_n)$.

In particular, both modules are free of rank $\ell^{\dim(G)}$, with $G \in \{M_n, GL_n\}$.

Proof. When specialising, Theorem 2.1(a) implies that $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}$ -module with $B_M|_{q=\varepsilon} = \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} \mid N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \ \forall i, j \right\}$ as basis — where, by abuse of notation, we write again t_{ij} for $t_{ij}|_{q=\varepsilon}$. Now, whenever the exponent N_{ij} is a multiple of ℓ , the power $t_{ij}^{N_{ij}}$ belongs to the isomorphic image $\mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{r}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n))$ of $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$ inside $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$, hence it is a scalar for the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$ -module structure of $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$. Therefore, reducing all exponents modulo ℓ we find that B_{GL}^M is a spanning set for the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$ -module $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$. In addition, $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}}(M_n)$ clearly admits as $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis the set $\overline{B}_M = \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n \bar{t}_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}} \mid N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \ \forall i, j \right\}$. It follows that $\overline{B}_M$ is also a $\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}$ -basis of $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$, so $\mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{r}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\overline{B}_M) = \left\{ \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{\ell N_{i,j}} \mid N_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \ \forall i, j \right\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}$ -basis of $\mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{r}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n))$. This last fact easily implies that B_{GL}^M is also $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$ -linearly independent, hence it is a basis of $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$ over $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$ as claimed.

As to $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(GL_n)$, from definitions and the analysis in §1 we get (with $D_{\varepsilon} := D_q|_{\varepsilon}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(GL_n) &= \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)[D_{\varepsilon}^{-1}] = \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)[D_{\varepsilon}^{-\ell}] = \\ &= \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)[D^{-1}] \bigotimes_{\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)} \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n) = \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(GL_n) \bigotimes_{\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)} \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n) \end{aligned}$$

thus the result for $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(GL_n)$ follows at once from that for $\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon}^{\mathbb{Z}_{\varepsilon}}(M_n)$. $\square$

§ 3 Frobenius structures

3.1 Frobenius extensions and Nakayama automorphisms. Following [BGStro], we say that a ring R is a *free Frobenius extension* over a subring S , if R is a free S -module of finite rank, and there is an isomorphism $F: R \rightarrow \text{Hom}_S(R, S)$ of R - S -bi-modules. Then F provides a non-degenerate associative S -bilinear form $\mathbb{B}: R \times R \rightarrow S$, via $\mathbb{B}(r, t) = F(t)(r)$. Conversely, one can characterise Frobenius extensions using such forms. When $S = \mathcal{Z}$ is contained in the centre of R , there is a $\mathcal{Z}$ -algebra automorphism $\nu: R \rightarrow R$, given by $r F(1) = F(1) \nu(r)$ (for all $r \in R$), and such $\mathbb{B}(x, y) = \mathbb{B}(\nu(y), x)$. This is called the *Nakayama automorphism*, and it is uniquely determined by the pair $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq R$, up to $\text{Int}(R)$.

Proposition 3.2. (cf. [BGStro], §2)

Let R be a ring, $\mathcal{Z}$ an affine central subalgebra of R . Assume that R is free of finite rank as a $\mathcal{Z}$ -module, with a $\mathcal{Z}$ -basis $\mathcal{B}$ that satisfies the following condition: there exists a $\mathcal{Z}$ -linear functional $\Phi: R \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ such that for any non-zero $a = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} z_b b \in R$ there exists $x \in R$ for which $\Phi(xa) = u z_b$ for some unit $u \in \mathcal{Z}$ and some non-zero $z_b \in \mathcal{Z}$.

Then R is a free Frobenius extension of $\mathcal{Z}$. Moreover, for any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of $\mathcal{Z}$, the finite dimensional quotient $R/\mathfrak{m}R$ is a finite dimensional Frobenius algebra.

This result is used in [BGStro] to show that many families of algebras — in particular, some related to $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$, where G is a (complex, connected, simply-connected) semisimple affine algebraic group — are indeed free Frobenius extensions. But the authors could not prove the same for $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$, as they did not know an explicit $\mathcal{O}(G)$ –basis of $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(G)$. Now, following their strategy and using Theorem 2.3, I shall now prove that $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ is free Frobenius over $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ when G is M_n or GL_n .

Theorem 3.3. *Let G be M_n or GL_n . Then $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ is a free Frobenius extension of $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$, with Nakayama automorphism ν given by $\nu(t_{i,j}) = \varepsilon^{2(i+j-n-1)} t_{i,j}$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, n$).*

Proof. We prove that there exists a suitable $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ –linear functional $\Phi : \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ as required in Proposition 3.2, so that that result applies to $R := \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ and $\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$.

Define Φ on the elements of the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ –basis B_{GL}^M of $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ (see Theorem 2.3) by

$$\Phi\left(\prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}}\right) := \prod_{i,j=1}^n \delta_{N_{i,j}, \ell-1} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } N_{i,j} = \ell-1 \ \forall i, j \\ 0, & \text{if not} \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

(for all $0 \leq N_{i,j} \leq \ell-1$), and extend to all of $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ by $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ –linearity. In other words, Φ is the unique $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ –valued linear functional on $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ whose value is 1 on the basis element $\underline{t}^{\ell-1} := \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{\ell-1}$ and is zero on all other elements of the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ –basis B_{GL}^M .

We claim that Φ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, so the latter applies and proves our statement. Indeed, let us consider any non-zero $a = \sum_{\underline{t} \in B_{GL}^M} z_{\underline{t}} \underline{t} \in \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$, and

let $\underline{t}_0 = \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N_{i,j}}$ in B_{GL}^M be such that $z_{\underline{t}_0} \neq 0$ and $w(\underline{t}_0)$ is maximal (w.r.t. $\leq_{lex}$). Then

define $\underline{t}_0^\vee := \prod_{i,j=1}^n t_{i,j}^{N'_{i,j}}$ ($\in B_{GL}^M$) with $N'_{i,j} := \ell-1-N_{i,j}$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Quoting

from the proof of Theorem 2.1(a), we know that $\underline{t}_0^\vee \underline{t}_0 = \varepsilon^s \underline{t}^{\ell-1} + l.t.'s$, where $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the expression $l.t.'s$ now stands for an $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ –linear combination of monomials $\check{\underline{t}} \in B_{GL}^M$ such that $w(\check{\underline{t}}) \not\leq_{lex} w(\underline{t}^{\ell-1})$; in particular, $\Phi(\check{\underline{t}}) = 0$ for all these $\check{\underline{t}}$, hence eventually $\Phi(\underline{t}_0^\vee \underline{t}_0) = \varepsilon^s \Phi(\underline{t}^{\ell-1}) = \varepsilon^s$. Similarly, if $\underline{t}' \in B_{GL}^M$ is such that $w(\underline{t}') <_{lex} w(\underline{t})$, then $\underline{t}_0^\vee \underline{t}'$ is an $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ –linear combination of PBW monomials whose weight is at most $w(\underline{t}_0^\vee \underline{t}')$, hence $\Phi(\underline{t}_0^\vee \underline{t}') = 0$. As we chose $\underline{t}_0$ so that $w(\underline{t}_0)$ is maximal, we eventually find

$$\Phi(\underline{t}_0^\vee a) = \sum_{\underline{t} \in B_{GL}^M} z_{\underline{t}} \Phi(\underline{t}) = z_{\underline{t}_0} \Phi(\underline{t}_0) = \varepsilon^s z_{\underline{t}_0}$$

where ε^s is a unit in $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$. So Φ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 3.2, as claimed.

As to the Nakayama automorphism $\nu : \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$, it is characterized (see §3.1) by the property that $\mathbb{B}(x, y) = \mathbb{B}(\nu(y), x)$ for all $x, y \in R$. Here $\mathbb{B}$ is a $\mathcal{Z}$ –bilinear form as in §3.1, which now is related to Φ by the formula $\mathbb{B}(x, y) = \Phi(xy)$ for all $x, y \in R$.

As Φ is an automorphism, and $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ is generated — over $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ — by the $t_{i,j}$ ’s, the claim about ν is proved if we show that

$$\Phi\left(\prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s}} \cdot t_{i,j}\right) = \Phi\left(\varepsilon^{2(i+j-n-1)} t_{i,j} \cdot \prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s}}\right) \quad (3.2)$$

Now, our usual argument shows that the expansions of the product of a generator $t_{i,j}$ and a PBW monomial $\prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s}}$ (in either order of the factors) as an $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ –linear combination of elements of the $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{Z}_\varepsilon}(G)$ –basis B_{GL}^M are of the form

$$\prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s}} \cdot t_{i,j} = \varepsilon^{i+j-2n} \prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s} + \delta_{r,i} \delta_{j,s}} + l.t.'s$$

$$t_{i,j} \cdot \prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s}} = \varepsilon^{2-i-j} \prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s} + \delta_{r,i} \delta_{j,s}} + l.t.'s$$

This along with (3.1) gives

$$\Phi\left(\prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s}} \cdot t_{i,j}\right) = \varepsilon^{i+j-2n} \Phi\left(\prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s} + \delta_{r,i} \delta_{j,s}}\right) = \varepsilon^{i+j-2n} \quad \text{if } e_{r,s} = \ell - 1 - \delta_{r,i} \delta_{j,s}$$

$$\Phi\left(\prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s}} \cdot t_{i,j}\right) = \varepsilon^{i+j-2n} \Phi\left(\prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s} + \delta_{r,i} \delta_{j,s}}\right) = 0 \quad \text{if not}$$

and similarly

$$\Phi\left(t_{i,j} \cdot \prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s}}\right) = \varepsilon^{2-i-j} \Phi\left(\prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s} + \delta_{r,i} \delta_{j,s}}\right) = \varepsilon^{2-i-j} \quad \text{if } e_{r,s} = \ell - 1 - \delta_{r,i} \delta_{j,s}$$

$$\Phi\left(t_{i,j} \cdot \prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s}}\right) = \varepsilon^{2-i-j} \Phi\left(\prod_{r,s=1}^n t_{r,s}^{e_{r,s} + \delta_{r,i} \delta_{j,s}}\right) = 0 \quad \text{if not}$$

Direct comparison now shows that (3.2) holds, q.e.d. $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks I. Gordon, Z. Skoda, C. Stroppel and the referee for several useful comments.

REFERENCES

- [AKP] H. H. Andersen, W. Kexin, P. Polo, *Representations of quantum algebras*, Invent. Math. **104** (1991), 1–59.
- [Be] G. M. Bergman, *The Diamond Lemma for Ring Theory*, Adv. Math. **29** (1978), 178–218.
- [BG] K. A. Brown, I. Gordon, *The ramifications of the centres: quantised function algebras at roots of unity*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **84** (2002), 147–178.
- [BGStaf] K. A. Brown, I. Gordon, J. T. Stafford, $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon[G]$ is a free module over $\mathcal{O}[G]$, preprint <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.QA/0007179> (2000), 3 pages.
- [BGStro] K. A. Brown, I. Gordon, C. Stroppel, *Cherednik, Hecke and quantum algebras as free modules and Calabi-Yau extensions*, preprint <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.RT/0607170> (2006), 31 pages.
- [CP] V. Chari, A. Pressley, *A guide to Quantum Groups*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [DL] C. De Concini, V. Lyubashenko, *Quantum function algebra at roots of 1*, Adv. Math. **108** (1994), 205–262.
- [DRZ] L. Dąbrowski, C. Reina, A. Zampa, *$A(SL_q(2))$ at roots of unity is a free module over $A(SL(2))$* , Lett. Math. Phys. **52** (2000), 339–342.
- [Ga] F. Gavarini, *Quantum function algebras as quantum enveloping algebras*, Comm. Algebra **26** (1998), 1795–1818.
- [Ko] H. T. Koelink, *On $\ast$ -representations of the Hopf $\ast$ -algebra associated with the quantum group $U_q(n)$* , Compositio Math. **77** (1992), 199–231.
- [LS] T. Levasseur, J. T. Stafford, *The quantum coordinate ring of the special linear group*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **86** (1993), 181–186.
- [PW] B. Parshall, J. Wang, *Quantum linear groups*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **89** (1991), no. 439.

FABIO GAVARINI

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI ROMA “TOR VERGATA” — DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA
 VIA DELLA RICERCA SCIENTIFICA 1, I-00133 ROMA, ITALY — GAVARINI@MAT.UNIROMA2.IT
<http://www.mat.uniroma2.it/~gavarini/page-web.html>